DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 020 EA 018 754

AUTHOR Glatthorn, Allan A.
TITLE Reconceptualizing Supervision: A Contribution to a Theory of Practice.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at a meeting of the National Commission on Supervision (Las Vegas, NV, February 1986).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Leadership; Models; Observation; *Professional Development; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a new way of thinking about teacher supervision that takes into account the everyday experience of the teacher in the classroom. The paper suggests eliminating old habits of thought by using new language with new connotations--instead of "supervision," the new approach is called "professional development." Professional development is one of three functions of "educational leadership," an activity in which all educators may be engaged to various degrees. The other two functions are curriculum development and organizational development. Professional development is divided in its turn into four components: staff development, including formal and informal methods for working with groups of teachers to achieve organizational goals; informal observations consisting of brief classroom visits improving the administrator's knowledge of teachers' activities, styles, and needs; formal rating processes providing specific information to be used for employment-related evaluation; and individual development, comprising processes used to help teachers meet personal, individual needs. The paper also suggests considering supervision as a craft, a science, and an art, all at once. All three of these aspects of supervision must be exercised if professional development efforts are to be thorough and effective. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Allan Glatthorn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Allan A. Glatthorn
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

RECONCEPTUALIZING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION TO A THEORY OF PRACTICE

(A paper presented at a meeting of the National Commission on Supervision in Las Vegas, Nevada, February, 1986.)

These are interesting times for those of us concerned with the professional development of teachers. We have a growing body of knowledge about the nature of teacher effectiveness in general and about the more effective ways to teach specific subjects and groups of learners. There is increased interest in and knowledge of the way teachers think. And there are numerous attempts to restructure the role of the teacher and to re-think the nature of teacher work.

At such a time of ferment, it seems propitious to attempt to reconceptualize supervision in the light of new knowledge--to examine our assumptions, to criticize our practices, and to develop new ways of thinking about our profession. In doing so on this occasion, I hope to be able to make a modest contribution to what Sergiovanni (1986) calls a "theory of practice for supervision"--a theory that takes account of the complex messiness of classrooms and teaching, that uses the practical language of classroom life, that is sensitive to the way teachers and supervisors construe classroom meanings, and that is explicitly designed to improve teaching and learning. In that task I will attempt to

EA 018 754

synthesize the best available research and the results of my own work with several school districts in helping them develop their own systems for professional development.

In this attempt to reconceptualize supervision, I find it useful to substitute the term professional development for those activities ordinarily subsumed under the heading of supervision. The advantage of using new terminology is that it facilitates the task of reconceptualizing the field by distancing us from the restrictive assumptions implicit in the old language. Let us then use professional development in this sense:

> All those systematic processes used by school administrators, supervisors, and teachers to help teachers grow professionally.

In examining the nature of professional development, I would first like to link it to the more general construct of educational leadership, then examine its separate components, and finally reflect about its implications for the training and development of supervisors.

The Functions of Educational Leadership

In recent years we have perhaps heard too much about the principal as an instructional leader. While such discussion has been useful in helping principals re-think their priorities, it has been flawed in two significant ways. It has first of all emphasized unduly the principal

and thus slighted the important contributions of supervisors and teachers. And it has too narrowly focused on instruction, thus slighting the organizational context and the school curriculum. It thus seems more useful to think of educational leadership as a comprehensive set of functions, not roles, designed to help the professional staff accomplish the goals of student growth.

In this sense, then, educational leadership seems to involve three related groups of tasks--curriculum development, organizational development, and professional development. Curriculum development denotes the leadership processes involved in designing, implementing, and managing the curriculum. Organizational development, as the term is used here, designates all those processes intended to improve the climate and the structure of the school as an organization. It subsumes such activities as assessing and improving the school climate, restructuring the role of the teacher, modifying grouping practices, and strengthening the school's capacity to identify and solve educational problems. And professional development, as indicated above, includes all those processes designed to facilitate the growth of the professional staff.

Three points might be noted here about this tri-partite analysis. First, the three sets of functions are obviously closely related: curricular changes will often necessitate modifications in the organizational structure and require the acquisition of new instructional strategies. Second, the three functions should not be the prerogative of designated roles: district specialists, building principals, school-based supervisors, and classroom teachers can all play an

important part. Finally, the relative importance of the three functions will vary depending upon the needs of the organization at a specific point in time. In one year professional development might have top priority; in the next year, organizational development.

Thus professional development is one of the crucial functions of educational leadership and is a set of closely related processes that can be performed by several role incumbents.

The Components of Professional Development

Those professional development processes are divided into four distinct yet related tasks: staff development; informal observations; rating; and individual development. Let us examine each briefly.

Staff Development

Staff development is used here to designate all those district- and school-sponsored programs, both formal and informal, offered to groups of teachers in response to organizational needs. There are several issues that seem important in examining staff development.

First, staff development can be both formal and informal. Formal staff development programs are those with a specific agenda, a set schedule, and a structured set of experiences. Typically such formal programs are skill-focused. And the research on such skill-focused programs suggests that they will be more effective if they embody the

tested practices listed in Figure 1. (The practices listed in Figure 1 are derived from an excellent review by Sparks, 1983.)

/Insert Figure 1 about here.

Even the best formal programs seem to make two major errors. Too many seem unduly concerned with the linear transmission and translation of knowledge intro practice, using consultants who, in effect, say, "Here is the research on effective teaching; let me explain how you should use it." For example, contributors to the 1983 National Society for the Study of Education yearbook on staff development recommend that those planning the content of staff development should begin by examining the results of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, a research project conducted in the late 1970's, in second and fifth grade classrooms. (See Howey and Vaughan, 1983.)

Now while there is an obvious need for teachers to be informed about such research, I believe we would achieve much better results by using an approach which Buchmann (1985) calls "conversation about teaching," a dialogic encounter of peers. Buchmann describes the tone of such conversation in this fashion:

> In conversation, ideas...collide and mingle with one another and are diluted and complicated in the process. The pleasant tone of conversation is inimical to doctrinaire notions. In conversation, one may differ and still not disagree; the defensive, corrective, and didactic aspects of rhetoric are out of place. People do not insist that partners follow; it

> is enough that they enter into conversation. Thus, conversation respects great differences and ranges easily over different provinces of meaning: dreams, play, science, and action. (p. 449)

Thus we might imagine a dialogic staff development session in which a linguist, a district language arts coordinator, an English department chair, a principal, and several English teachers are holding a conversation about the teaching of grammar--discussing the contributions of contemporary grammars, the functions of teaching grammar, the implications of research on the teaching of grammar, and the possibilities of conducting classroom-based research on students' use of language.

The second error reflected in too many district staff development programs is that they are too individualistic and neglect organizational needs. Here I find myself in complete agreement with the position taken by Fielding and Schalock (1985) in their review of staff development:

> /Staff/ development rarely responds to overall district priorities for improvement. Inservice activities are more likely to deal with a series of discrete and unrelated topics or a common theme. It appears that one of the most important responsibilities of central office staff is to anchor plans for staff development to long-term district goals. (p. 56)

So formal staff development programs can be effective if they reflect sound research, create a spirit of dialog, and respond to district goals. However, they should be supplemented with an array of informal staff development approaches. Ineffective principals and supervisors complain that they do not have time for staff development; effective leaders use whatever time is available. They work with small

groups of teachers during preparation periods, over lunch, and in faculty meetings in a less systematic and structured fashion, sharing ideas, discussing current educational issues, and engaging in some informal problem solving.

Informal Observations

Informal observations are brief unannounced classroom visits, lasting perhaps from five to fifteen minutes. In an earlier (1984) work I used the term administrative monitoring to designate such visits; however, in almost every school district in which I have worked, both administrators and teachers have criticized the term as having too many negative connotations and being too restrictive. In each instance they have in every case recommended that the term informal observations be used in its place. Other terms suggest themselves: some experts in the corporate world call such informal observations "managing by walking around." Or we might piggy-back on another concept currently fashionable in business jargon and designate the process as "the ten-minute supervisor."

The process of making numerous brief and informal observations can serve several purposes. It is a useful way of making the principal and the supervisor more visible and less office-bound, thus reducing the isolation that most teachers feel. It provides excellent opportunities for both principal and supervisor to reinforce and praise good teaching--catching teachers doing something right. It can provide useful

data about curriculum implementation. And it can alert leaders to instructional problems before they become critical.

Who should make such informal observations? While I previously saw the process serving solely administrative functions and thus falling solely within the purview of the principal, supervisors in districts where I have consulted have argued convincingly that they also need the opportunity to make such visits as part of their supervisory function.

How much value do such informal observations have? Here there is an interesting paradox. While many of the standard texts on supervision disparage such visits and insist that all observations should be for a full period and should be preceded by a conference, the research suggests otherwise. Several reviews of the research on effective schools (see, for example, Squires, Huitt, and Segars, 1981) conclude that in such schools the educational leader is highly visible, frequently monitors the classroom, stays well informed about daily life in the school, and demonstrates an interest in instruction by spending much time in the classroom. All these functions can be accomplished through informal observations. And in every school system in which I have helped institute a program of informal observations, the teachers have welcomed the process as long as it is not linked to the rating system.

Unfortunately, we do not have much research on how best to make informal observations. Let me therefore draw from my own experience and the insights of experienced principals and supervisors with whom I have worked in suggesting the following guidelines.

1. At the outset administrators and supervisors should resolve through discussions with teachers whether the data from informal observations will be used to rate teachers. Teachers will more readily accept the process if it is clear that informal observations are not linked with teacher evaluation, although many administrators would like to use such information in rating teachers.

2. Informal observations should be frequent and numerous. Effective principals and supervisors with whom I have worked report that they attempt to make at least ten informal observations each week by reserving time in their weekly schedules.

3. Immediate feedback is important. If the observer is pleased with what has been observed, then a smile, a gesture of approval, or a brief note may be enough, If some concerns are felt, a brief face-to-face conference is perhaps needed. At such a conference, the concern should be expressed only as a very tentative reaction: "I was there only for five minutes, of course, but I did note that many of the small groups seemed to be off-task. What is your perception?"

4. The informal observations will probably have more value for the leaders if they are somewhat systematic in their focus. Some informal observations should focus on a particular subject area: "What's going on in the language arts curriculum these days?" Some should focus on a particular grade level: "What does our eighth grade program look like?" Some should focus on particular groups of students: "What is it like to

be in a low ability class?" And some should focus on instructional methods: "How much teacher talk is going on?"

Rating

I use the word rating in this sense:

> The process of making formative and summative assessments of teacher performance for purposes of administrative decision-making.

The term is chosen to distinguish this formal assessment function from a more general act of evaluation, which in the context of this reconceptualization is construed to mean a judgment about the quality of performance made on any occasion for a variety of purposes. This distinction between rating and evaluation is intended to clarify the conceptual confusion that is so prevalent in our professional discourse. One interesting example of the conceptual confusion is McGreal's very fine monograph titled Successful Teacher Evaluation (1983), which I read as a treatise on teacher supervision.

Let me give some examples of the two concepts in order to provide more clarity. You make an informal observation of a teacher with a disorderly class. You make a judgment: you do not like what you see. You observe a teacher for the purpose of diagnosing teaching style. You try your best to be objective, but you find yourself smiling in approval. You conduct a staff development session and ask one of the

teachers to demonstrate the skill. You are not happy with the demonstration. In each instance you have made an evaluation--a judgment about quality. Despite all our attempts to be objective, it is probably impossible for us to observe the act of teaching without making judgments. I for one would not want an observer to pretend that he or she had not made any judgments about my performance. And there is some evidence that supervisors who are candid about their assessments are judged to be more effective than those who do not provide evaluative feedback. (See Gersten, Green, and Davis, 1985.)

Now consider a contrary example. You visit a teacher's class in September with a rating form in hand, in which very explicit criteria are stated along with the standards of performance. You observe the class and complete the rating form. You confer with the teacher and say, "Your performance in that class was not satisfactory; I hope your supervisor will be able to help you improve before the next rating observation." You have made a formative rating, as I use the term. You make several more formative rating observations throughout the year. Then in May you make a summative assessment based upon all your data and say to the teacher, "Your performance this year was unsatisfactory; your contract will not be renewed."

Perhaps one more analogy will help. The gymnast performs a set of exercises in a meet. The coach watches and says, "Your approach was faulty; we'll have to work on that." The coach has made an evaluation. The judges were also watching. They hold up their scorecards with numerical scores on each. The judges have made a rating.

What rating systems are most effective? After studying thirty-two school districts reported to have effective rating systems, Wise and his colleagues (1984) reached five conclusions:

1. To succeed the teacher evaluation system must suit the goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district.

2. Top-level commitment to and resources for evaluation are more important than the particular kind of checklist or procedures used.

3. The school district should decide about the main purpose of the rating system and then match the process to the purpose.

4. The evaluation process must be seen to have utility: it is cost-effective, valid, and reliable.

5. Teacher involvement in and responsibility for the process improves the quality of teacher evaluation.

Obviously these conclusions suggest that several types of rating systems can be effective. However, if our purpose is administrative decision-making, then I believe that a criterion-based system using multiple observations will be preferable. Let me describe how one such process might work.

Together administrators, supervisors, and teachers analyze the job of teaching and the research on effective teaching. From those reviews they develop a comprehensive set of criteria which includes three types of measures: the non-instructional aspects of role performance, such as supervising students in non-instructional settings; the essential instructional skills that are probably not always directly observable, such as making valid tests; and the essential instructional skills that are directly observable, such as sustaining a desirable learning environment.

The essential observable skills are assessed by means of what I call a rating observation. The rater tells the teacher that he or she will be observing the class some time next week in order to rate performance. The teacher is familiar with both the criteria and the indicators and understands clearly that the purpose of the observation is to rate, not to improve instruction. The rater arrives with a rating observation form in hand, which lists the same essential observable skills that appear on the summative form. The rater observes solely to rate: he or she makes careful notes throughout the lesson about the teacher's performance in relation to each of the criteria and then makes a holistic rating of the entire class. Then the rater holds a rating observation conference, informs the teacher of the general rating, reviews the specific strengths and weaknesses, and in conjunction with the teacher lays out a professional development plan for remedying any perceived deficiencies.

The essential non-observable skills are assessed through a careful evaluation of such documents as teacher-made tests, unit and daily lesson plans, and the teacher's record or roll book. The teacher's performance of non-instructional responsibilities is assessed by means of the rater's day-to-day observations of such performance, recorded in an anecdotal record.

Now obviously such a rating system will require a great amount of administrator and supervisor time if it is to be thorough--much more time than is perhaps warranted in relation to the value of the process. I therefore have recommended to some districts that they develop two rating tracks--standard rating and intensive rating. The standard rating is used with career teachers whose performance is clearly satisfactory; it is a pro forma compliance with the state school code, usually involving one observation and one final conference. An intensive rating is used with all probationary teachers, with any teachers being considered for special promotion, and with teachers whose level of performance is questionable. The intensive rating involves several observations by two or more observers, with a conference following each observation.

Individual Development

Individual development includes all the processes used by and with individual teachers to help them grow professionally. In contrast to staff development, the work is with the individual, not the group; and the needs of the individual, not the needs of the organization, predominate. For two reasons, a differentiated system of professional development is recommended--one that gives teachers some options in the type of developmental processes used. (A fuller explanation of how to

implement a differentiated system can be found in Glatthorn 1984.) First, as noted above, most principals are too busy to provide clinical supervision to all teachers. Second, teachers vary significantly in their conceptual development, in their learning styles, and in their professional needs; they thus should be provided with different types of developmental services. Accordingl, the differentiated system offers three options for individual development: intensive, cooperative, and self-directed.

Intensive development is what is ordinarily called "clinical supervision," although it is more broadly construed. It is an intensive and systematic process, in which a supervisor, an administrator, or an expert teacher works closely with an individual teacher in an attempt to effect significant improvement in the essential skills of teaching. While the intensive development is most needed by inexperienced and struggling teachers, it can be provided any teacher who wants to work with a skilled educational leader to bring about significant improvement in teaching performance. In providing intensive development, the leader works closely with the teacher in determining which of several processes will be used. Rather than relying solely on planning conferences, observations, and de-briefing conferences, they examine together a wide array of processes to determine which ones might be most effectively employed:

1. Planning conferences: conferring with the teacher on yearly planning, semester planning, unit planning, and daily planning.

2. Student assessment conferences: conferring with the teacher about assessing student progress, testing, grading, and record-keeping.

3. Diagnostic observations and diagnostic feedback: observing all significant transactions in a classroom in order to diagnose priority developmental needs and providing appropriate feedback.

4. Focused observations and feedback: observing one particular aspect of teaching and learning (such as classroom management) and providing appropriate feedback.

5. Video-tape analysis: making a video-tape of teaching and analyzing it with the teacher in order to complement direct observation.

6. Coaching: developing a particular teaching skill by providing a rationale, explaining the steps, demonstrating those steps, providing a supportive environment in which the teacher can use the skill, and giving the teacher feedback.

7. Descriptive student feedback: surveying students for their perceptions of the classroom by asking them to offer descriptive (not evaluative) feedback.

8. Directed observation of a colleague: structuring and guiding an opportunity for the teacher to observe a colleague use a specific skill.

Thus, intensive development provides a variety of supportive services, And to be most effective, those services are provided in a systematic manner. First, after an initial orientation session, the supervisor makes a diagnostic observation, one in which all important classroom interactions are recorded and analyzed in order to determine patterns of behavior. The supervisor analyzes those diagnostic data and tentatively identifies which skills can best be developed over the next two to three months. The supervisor and the teacher then confer about the observation. They review together those observational data and any other information they have and decide together on the skill development agenda for the months ahead. They formalize this decision in a Professional Development Plan, which lists the skills to be developed, the resources to be used, and the deadlines to be met.

They then begin to work together on the first skill. The supervisor coaches the teacher on the use of that skill. Then the supervisor makes a focused observation of one of the teacher's classes, gathering data just on the skill being developed. They confer again to decide whether more coaching and observing for that skill is needed or whether they should move to the next skill. It is an intensive process of diagnosing, developing a growth plan, coaching, holding a focused observation, and then assessing the next moves. Obviously it takes a great deal of time to implement effectively; the hope is, however, that only a few teachers in each school are involved in such intensive development.

Cooperative development is an option usually provided only to experienced and competent teachers; it enables small groups of teachers to work together in a collegial relationship for their mutual growth. It is intended to be a teacher-centered, teacher-directed process which respects the professionalism of competent teachers. While it requires administrative support, it does not require inordinate amounts of administrator or supervisor time; the expectation is that the cooperative groups can direct their own growth. In doing so, they may decide to use a variety of processes: observing and conferring about each other's classes; exchanging classes; collaborating on action research; developing curricular and instructional materials.

Self-directed development is an option usually provided to experienced and competent teachers who wish to work on their own, rather than as part of a cooperative team. Teachers who choose this option identify a small number of professional growth goals for the year and work independently in attempting to accomplish those goals. In a sense, the self-directed model is akin to the "management-by-objectives" assessment process, except that it is completely non-evaluative. The administrator or supervisor simply acts as a supportive resource for the teacher in the self-directed mode.

In general teachers should be able to choose which of these three options they prefer, with the understanding that all probationary teachers will be involved in the intensive mode and that the principal will be able to identify tenured teachers who should also be involved in this mode. A form facilitating these choices is shown in Figure 2.

These three individual development options provide teachers with a choice and enable supervisors and administrators to focus their supervisory efforts on those teachers in the intensive mode who most need their skilled services.

/Insert Figure 2 about here./

The Interrelationship of the Four Processes

How do these four processes for professional development inter-relate? Obviously they are closely related. The data derived from informal observations can be used to supplement the information derived from rating observations and can play an important part in assessing staff development needs. The rating process can help the supervisor or administrator identify those teachers who need intensive development.The activities undertaken in all the options for individual development can be linked with on-going staff development programs. And the staff development program can provide needed support for the individual development. All the processes obviously play a key role in improving the taught curriculum.

However, there are clear advantages for administrators and supervisors to examine the processes separately and analytically, since each requires different skills, provides different kinds of information, and employs different processes. In such an examination, the author has found it most useful to work with individual school districts to assist

them in developing their own model, rather than presenting them with a formulaic solution. Thus, some districts link rating and individual development rather closely; others keep them quite distinct. Some emphasize curriculum alignment in the informal observations; others focus on instructional processes. Some offer teachers only the cooperative and intensive options; others provide the full array. Since such matters are much affected by district size, administrative philosophy, and available resources, they are best resolved at the district level.

One particular local option needs to be emphasized here. As each district develops its own model, it determines who will be primarily responsible for each of the four approaches. Some districts limit the informal observations to administrators; others expect supervisors to be involved. Some require only administrators to rate; others expect input from the supervisory staff. Some districts use assistant principals for the intensive development; others used supervisors or expert teachers. Some expect administrators to direct staff development; others see that as a supervisory function. Rather than beginning with a set of fore-ordained conclusions about these important matters, the "professional development" approach suggested here enables local districts to resolve these issues in a way that makes most sense to their administrators, supervisors, and teachers.

Although the differentiated model has been found to be feasible and acceptable to teachers (see Glatthorn 1984), there again is no empirical research that proves it to be more effective than other approaches.

Implications for the Professional Development of Supervisors

What are the implications here for the professional development of supervisors as leaders? Rather than simply offering one more list of supervisory competencies, it might be more productive at this juncture

to put those skills in a theoretical framework by reflecting about the craft, the science, and the art of supervisory leadership.

Craft is the exercise of technical skills in the pursuit of some pre-determined end. THe definition owes much to Collingwood's (1958) analysis, which pointed out that the effective craftsperson first determines the end desired, selects the means necessary to accomplish that end, and in a masterful fashion applies those means somewhat systematically and at times routinely to achieve the intended goal. In this means-end orientation, the crafts person tends to focus on the parts, producing the whole in additive fashion. The purpose of craft is to produce the useful. Consequently, the essential criterion for judging the products of craft is utilitarian value: does it work? And in mastering a craft, we learn the tricks of the trade - - we share the folk wisdom of the practitioner.

What then is the craft of supervisory leadership? It is the mastery of the tools of supervision in order to achieve the desired end of effective teaching and learning. Now until recently, instructional supervision has too often relied upon only four tools: the pre-observation conference; the observation; the analysis of observational data; and the de-briefing conference. And one of the promising developments in supervision is the addition of new tools. Let me simply list some of those new tools without taking the time here to discuss them in detail: a planning conference that focuses on yearly and unit planning, curricular priorities, and the allocation of time; a student assessment conference that deals with test making, grading, record keeping, and the use of test results; the guided analysis of videotape;

a directed observation of a skilled peer; and coaching for skill development. All these processes are aspects of craft.

I also believe that such formulations as Madeline Hunter's (1984) "Essential Elements of Instruction" and my own (in process) "Essential Skills of Teaching" are aspects of our craft. In fact, I think that Madeline Hunter's major contribution to our profession is her work in translating scientific findings into elements of craft. And I do not say this disparagingly. The profession needs leaders like her who can evaluate, synthesize, and translate research findings into prescriptions for practice--who can make the transition from science to craft.

So to call these processes aspects of craft is not to depreciate their importance. They must be mastered if the supervisor is to be at all effective. The supervisor who has not learned the craft of supervision will have great difficulty in helping a teacher acquire the essential skills of teaching.

So craft is important--but craft alone is not enough. For craft without science and art can become only the mindless use of processes in an unreflective and unimaginative way.

What is science? Science is both process and product. As process, it is systematic disciplined inquiry, grounded in theory and rigorously pursued in the interests of increased understanding and insight. At times that inquiry is necessarily subjective, since all researchers are influenced by their own biases and their own experiences. But the scientist attempts to control and discipline such subjectivity and bias. And the product of scientific inquiry is not an eternal truth, but a tentative finding that needs to be tested and re-examined.

Do we have a science of supervisory leadership? Blumberg (1984) is quite vehement in his negative conclusion: "I think it is intellectually dishonest to conceive of school administration as an applied science" (p. 14). Now if we construe science to be the search for certitude and the application of "right answers," then, of course, he is right. However, if we construe it in the broader sense as theory-based, disciplined inquiry that produces some tentative guidelines for practice, then I would suggest that we are beginning to develop a science of instructional supervision.

What is the nature of that science? We have, first of all, a well-established set of findings about the nature of effective instruction in what Rosenshine and Stevens (1986) term "well-structured learning"--instructional systems and methods that seem effective when the learning task is unambiguous and clearly structured. As I have noted, those findings have been usefully synthesized in Madeline Hunter's "Effective Elements of Instruction" and in my own "Essential Skills of Teaching."

How useful are such formulations? One very helpful response is contained in Doyle's (1983) review of all the research on the direct instruction of cognitive processes. Let me cite his findings here since I believe they are very important in our emerging science of supervision.

1. Direct instruction in identified cognitive processes and knowledge structures is probably more appropriate than indirect methods for teaching novices, low ability students, and pupils in elementary grades.

2. Direct instruction that focuses on specific skills is likely to have few long-term consequences unless combined with instruction in higher level executive processes and knowledge structures to represent problems.

3. Indirect instruction is one way of providing practice in higher order executive routines and the use of knowledge structures to represent problems. Some degree of unstructuredness is essential to ascertain whether students really understand how and when to use their knowledge and skill. In addition, many operations constituting expertise in academic areas either have not been identified yet or are difficult to formulate into clearly teachable propositions. Or to put it briefly, excellence in teaching involves the ability to provide appropriately both direct and indirect instruction.

If we wish to help teachers productively integrate direct and indirect approaches, how can we best accomplish that difficult task? Here again we have an emerging science of instructional supervision which suggests both why direct instruction persists and why an overemphasis upon certain of the "essential elements" might militate against effort to foster indirect instruction.

Here is the general picture that emerges from a growing body of research on the teacher and the classroom.

The teacher is primarily concerned with classroom management. The classroom, from the teacher's perspective, is a potentially threatening situation of much ambiguity and risk. There are thirty students, many of whom are not really concerned with what the teacher has to teach. They are all different, even in classes which have been grouped by ability. The teacher's response to such ambiguity and threat is to

routinize and standardize all interactions so that they become more predictable and thus more controllable. THus, management drives both instruction and curriculum. It drives instruction, first of all. From the teacher's perspective, the immediate task of teaching, as Doyle (1983) notes, is that of gaining and maintaining the cooperation of students in activities that fill the available time. In general, his review indicates that 60 to 70 percent of class time is spent in seatwork in which students complete assignments, check homework, or take tests. The function of such seatwork, obviously, is to simplify management by establishing an easily controlled environment.

The concern for management also produces a classroom climate in which evaluation of conduct and performance plays a very important role. Sieber (1979) notes that teachers evaluate student conduct publicly about 87 times a day; Carter and Doyle (1982) found an elaborate system of points associated with academic work. Answers are thus not perceived as part of a learning dialog but instead as points in an accountability system. Students respond to such an over-emphasis on accountability in predictable ways: They seduce the teacher into making the questions easier and more explicit; and they take seriously only work for which they are held explicitly accountable.

Second, the concern for management drives the curriculum. Teachers, researchers have found, will predictably reduce the complexity of the curriculum, in order to secure a higher level of student cooperation and to routinize the instructional processes. Thus, a teacher asked to teach a curriculum that emphasizes openness and complexity, such as creative writing or scientific inquiry, will reduce that curriculum to a series of low-level sequential tasks. In such a transformation the

student is a very willing accomplice. If this picture is an accurate one--and I believe it is--then it explains perhaps why an inflexible and insensitive use of the Hunter model might only sustain unimaginative teaching. In its emphasis on direct instruction, guided practice, and student assessment, it can reinforce the teacher who is concerned primarily with routine and control. Or, as one teacher told me, "I like the Hunter model --it makes it easy for me to get the administrators off my back."

So the science of supervision can provide us with some tentative insights about the nature and value of direct instruction, can highlight its limitations, and can explain why it persists. And we need to be sure that we as educational leaders continue to stay abreast of our emerging science.

But neither craft nor science alone can enable us to help teachers move beyond the safety of direct instruction. For that we need art as well.

What is art? I would define it as the use of creativity and intuition in the creation of environments and products that are inherently worthwhile. Or, as Collingwood reminds us, it is the use of technical skill in the service of a vision. Thus the purpose of art is to create works of beauty and quality. In doing so, the focus is on the whole, not the parts, and the essential criterion is intrinsic quality, not utility.

What is the art of supervisory leadership? Let me speak briefly here about five critical aspects of this art.

Vision

The first aspect of the art of leadership is vision. Remember that Collingwood defined art as technique in the service of a vision. So we begin with vision. The craftsperson-leader looks at the school as it is now and tinkers with its parts to make it work better. The scientific leader extrapolates from the present and determines what the school should be five years from now if research-based strategies are applied in a systematic way. The artist as leader has a vision. It is a picture of the possible dream, a view of what the school could be if it could energize the noblest impulses of all those involved. As one of the respondents put it in describing a principal in Blumberg's (1984) study, "/Our principal/ has a ready-made image of a world that doesn't exist but could. And he speaks that image all the time" (p. 17).

And Grant (1985) notes that an essential ingredient in this vision is what he terms "a strong positive ethos" based upon a character ideal--an ethos communicated not just by formal statements and commencement speeches but also by examples and stories of exemplary students, patron saints, and beloved teachers.

The vision serves several purposes. It energizes us by holding before us an attainable goal: This is what we can become. It changes our perspective. It lifts our eyes from an absorption with the present and its petty difficulties and raises them to the future and its bright promise. And it brings us closer together as we move forward to a dream we all share. Or, as the writer of Proverbs reminds us, "Without a vision the people perish."

Vision seems most essential for the supervisor in three ways. First, our vision of the organization enables us to make our supervisory efforts more coherent and integrated. It links our efforts in staff

development, evaluation, and supervision to a quest for organizational excellence.

Second, our vision of what the individual teacher can become provides a meaningful context for the development of individual skills. If we can help the teacher articulate a vision of what he or she wishes to become as a teacher, then our skill development agenda has meaning, direction, and consequence.

Finally, our vision of ourselves as supervisors directs our own growth. Even as we become mired in the routines of the role and feel frustrated with the political infighting, we slowly move towards that vision of what we can become. Pushing back the forces of stagnation, we move towards life.

A Concern for Quality

In moving towards that vision the artist as leader is concerned with quality. The craftsperson is concerned with utility and the scientist with quantifiable validity. But it is quality--inherent and intrinsic worth--that most concerns the artist.

Let us pause for a moment here to reflect about quantity and quality as dimensions of educational experience. Now in doing so, I do not choose to deliver a polemic against quantification as an aspect of assessment. For matters of organizational efficiency, we need readily quantifiable standards and measures--credit hours, test scores, and achievement levels. In a technological age any school that does not produce quantified evidence of its accomplishments is likely to lose credibility.

However, there is disconcerting evidence that we have become too concerned with quantity at the expense of quality. To illustrate the problem, I would like to examine two currently fashionable reforms that are essentially concerned with the quantity of learning--increasing time on task and increasing the time devoted to academic subjects.

The first quantity-based reform, increasing time on task, has both a common-sense appeal and some empirical support. It makes sense to believe that keeping students on task will increase their achievement; and some studies (see, for example, Rossmiller 1982) document the relationship between engaged time and achievement. But, for two reasons, there is no warrant for what seems to be an unthinking obsession with time on task. The first reason is that the relationship between time on task and achievement has perhaps been over-stated. In a very careful review of all the evidence, Karweit (1983) concludes as follows:

> ...the review conducted here concludes that, by a variety of criteria for the importance of an effect, the most outstanding finding relating the effects of time-on-task to learning is that the effects are as small as they are. (p. 46)

The other reason, of course, is that the concern with time-on-task ignores the qualitative dimension: time on what task? What is the quality of that learning experience? Is it filling in the blanks in a drill book or thinking creatively in group inquiry? The answer is clear, of course: the task too often involves practicing with test-like items. We have locked ourselves in cages of our own devising: we use achievement tests that measure low-level skills, devise instructional materials to teach those skills, and then develop more effective systems for requiring students to deal with the banal and the trivial.

The second quantity-based reform is increasing the time allocated to the academic disciplines. As of February,1985, forty-five of the states had increased graduation requirements and five had such proposals under consideration (Education Week, 1985). Now there is some evidence to support such improvements: a careful analysis of the research by Alexander and Pallas (1983) concluded that students who completed the "new basics" curriculum would, in fact, perform better on tests of cognitive achievement in verbal and mathematical reasoning.

There are, however, some remaining questions about the new academic requirements. First, as Alexander and Pallas note, such cognitive achievement is only one of the several goals of American education; and undue concern with this one goal may result in the slighting of such other important outcomes as the development of creativity and the nurturing of aesthetic awareness. The second caution is that the effects may not be as large as anticipated. Consider here a very important study by Levin, Glass, and Meister (1984), who performed a careful analysis of the cost effectiveness of four interventions for increasing reading and mathematics achievement scores: cross-age tutoring, computer assisted instruction, reducing class size, and increasing instructional time. They determined that cross-age tutoring was highest on the cost effectiveness measure--and increasing instructional time was the lowest. THe final reservation, of course, is the central one of quality. Goodlad (1984) carefully documented what all of us have known: much of what passes for education is trivial, boring, and repetitious. One more year spent reviewing the explorers will not produce more highly motivated students.

So the artist as leader asks about quality: what is the quality of the learning experience? what is the quality of the curriculum? what is the quality of the school environment? what is the quality of teacher-student interactions?

Creative Intuition

In that quest for quality the artist as leader tends to rely more upon his or her creative intuition. THe craftsperson relies on rules of thumb; the scientist falls back on empirically grounded principles; the artist relies on intuition. Schein (1973) aptly points out that basic and applied sciences are "convergent"--but that practice is "divergent"--it has unique and unpredictable elements. Thus in his view, the effective professional is one who has the ability to "take a convergent knowledge base and convert it into professional services that are tailored to the unique requirements of the client system" (p. 45). Or to use the constructs used here, the effective professional moves from science to art.

Schon (1983) goes even further perhaps. He argues that every successful professional employs what he terms "knowing in action" that operates in the following fashion:

> In his day-to-day practice he makes innumerable judgments of quality for which he cannot state adequate criteria, and he displays skills for which he cannot state the rules and procedures. Even when he makes conscious use of research-based theories and techniques, he is dependent on tacit recognitions, judgments, and skillful performances. (p. 50)

So the educational leader relies upon his or her creative intuition, the implicit wisdom derived from meaningful experience and brought into awareness by a process of discernment. Let us again

consider an example. You observe a beginning teacher in a classroom. You have in your hands a checklist of effective teaching skills--most of which this teacher seems not to have mastered. But you sense that the teacher is struggling with the issue of power--there are uncertainty in his voice and a lack of assertiveness in his stance. And your creative intuition tells you to put aside the checklist and try to help the teacher articulate the tension he feels between the role of the teacher and his sense of self. The craftsperson would have talked about where the "troublemakers" were sitting. The scientist would have handed the teacher a tally of off-task student behaviors. But the artist says, "I have a hunch that you are struggling with the issue of power in the classroom. How do you feel about yourself as one who must use power at times?"

And the supervisor as artist relies upon intuition, perhaps, in deciding several subtle issues: which conference style is most appropriate? which teachers can benefit from peer supervision? which teachers can become more effective by using the Hunter model? All these matters are matters of artistic intuition, not scientific judgment.

A Sense of Humor

The leader as artist also has a sense of humor, I believe. Now this trait will never show up in a synthesis of the research on effective school principals. But my own reading of the literature on creativity suggests that creativity and humor are closely linked. Getzels and Jackson (1959) are among several who have noted the high correlation between humor and the creative function. And Koestler (1964) reminds us that the comic and the creative are in some ways different

manifestations of the same bisociative perspective. The creative artist embodies a sense of playfulness, an appreciation of the absurd, a delight in the whimsical.

For the educational leader-as-artist, this sense of humor seems especially important. Note again two comments from teachers who were interviewed by Blumberg (1984):

> His humor works as a glue.
> He has a sense of the absurd and the ability to treat absurdity as just that.

This sense of humor enables us to keep a sense of perspective about our own work that keeps us suitably modest. If we can laugh at our own foibles, we are less likely to take ourselves too seriously. And that sense of humor enables us to deal with the vexations of our professional lives more effectively. We stand back and laugh at the absurdity of a supervisor telling a teacher to use the Hunter model without giving the teacher an opportunity for guided practice.

A Sense of Conscience

The last and perhaps most important dimension of leadership as art is a sense of conscience. Here I find Thomas Green's (1984) John Dewey Lecture most stimulating and enlightening. He has expressed here in very cogent fashion what I have been struggling to articulate over the course of many years. Let me therefore take the liberty of paraphrasing at length.

Green defines conscience as reflexive judgment--reason commenting upon our own behavior. He analyzes five "voices of conscience" important in a technological age: conscience as craft; conscience as

membership; conscience as sacrifice; conscience as memory; and conscience as imagination. The first of these, conscience as craft, is the capacity to judge our own work that results in self-satisfaction with a job well done, shame at slovenly work, and embarrassment at carelessness. As the leader develops a mastery of the craft, he or she develops the sense of the craft conscience. Conscience as membership is the conscience we develop as a member of a community--"the conscience formed for conduct in the skills of public life" (p. 7). It is our awareness of our moral responsibility to the profession, to the school, to the community--our ability to judge whether our actions have contributed to the public weal. Conscience as sacrifice is the voice of judgment that reminds us that at times we must sacrifice our self-interest to the interest of others. It is the voice that calls us to perform acts that go beyond the limits of duty.

Conscience as memory, in Green's terms, is the voice that speaks to us from our rootedess in tradition--it is the conscience nurtured by our tradition. I call myself a Christian, and the Christian tradition summons me to actualize in my professional life--to the extent feasible--the gospel of Christ. Finally, conscience as imagination is the conscience that moves us to articulate our dreams--it is a conscience formed by the prophets and the poets--the visionaries who disturb us so profoundly.

Now I would argue that the artist as leader needs to nurture all these voices of conscience--as craft, as membership, as sacrifice, as memory, as vision. For we are engaged in a moral enterprise--the education of the young. In a dizzying world we have found a place to

stand--in the school-and it is there that we create our own sense of meaning by following the voices of an enlightened conscience.

For we face in this nation an unfinished agenda. An arms race proliferates. Racial and ethnic prejudice seems to grow stronger. Bias against immigrants flourishes. Censorship is resurgent. Sexism persists. The aged are ignored and the poor are underfed. And we deal with a generation of youth who seem especially self-absorbed and materialistic. The challenges are so great that they almost overwhelm us.

But we can take a stand against ignorance, hatred, and selfishness. We can teach the young that there are other ways to live. We can model honesty and courage. We can create in our schools a sense of justice and a spirit of trust. We can hold before our students a vision of what they might become. And little by little as we touch their lives, we make a profound difference.

In a sense we remember Martin Buber's version of the old Hasidic parable. "Keep a stone in each pocket," the parable goes. "On one stone it is written--'You count as nothing in God's universe,' and on the other it is written, 'You are the most important person in the world.'"

Nurturing the Supervisor as Artist

Let me conclude by reflecting briefly about this final matter--how to nurture the artist-supervisor. How can we develop the artist in ourselves? The answer is a complex one that needs more than a few final words in a paper of this sort. Rather than attempting a complete

analysis, let me reflect briefly about only a few aspects of the matter. I would suggest that the artist-in-the-leader can be nurtured in an environment characterized by three important attributes - a reason for laughter, a time for quiet, a place for conscience.

First we as educational leaders need a reson for laughter-- the desire to cultivate in ourselves a better sense of humor. We have become a grim profession, buffeted by attacks from politicians, professors, and the public. One way of responding to such mindless attacks is to gain the perspective that a sense of humor brings us. Let me just sketch in a few of the current developments that bring a smile to my own lips:

*A politician who claims credit for an increase in SAT scores that began before he took office.

*A leading state educator who believes that simply raising the standards for acceptable writing will produce better writing.

*Community leaders who believe they can attract quality teachers by offering them a beginning salary of $15,000.

We are all weak and imperfect. But the ability to laugh at our own failings is partially redemptive. And we can become more effective by cultivating in ourselves a sense of the playful.

A Time for Quiet

Second, we need a time for quiet. The artist needs solitude and silence. And we need to create in our own professional lives a place apart where the silence can restore. In that solitude and silence we can restore the balance we have lost. For, despite the public impression that educators have easy jobs with long vacations, the

pressures of our role often push us into a spirit-depleting busy-ness. We spend too much time in speaking and not enough in listening. We are caught up in a torrent of words and have lost the capacity to discern the unspoken. We take a harried self to meetings and our tension exacerbates the conflict. And we are so busy instructing others that we have stopped educating ourselves. It is time to be still.

A Place for Conscience

Finally, we must take pains to sensitize our professional conscience--to listen especially to what Green calls the voice of conscience as membership. While there is that unfinished national agenda which needs our attention, there are injustices closer to hand that cry out for redress. We need to take a stand against censorship. We need to become a voice of reason in the hysteria about AIDS. We need to continue the fight to eliminate racism and sexism in every aspect of schooling. In short, we need to exercise our leadership in fighting the battles of injustice and ignorance that are close at hand.

So in the days ahead may you find your own reason for laughter, a time for quiet, and a place for conscience.

REFERENCES

Alexander, K. L. & Pallas, A. M. (1983). Curriculum reform and school performance: An evaluation of the "new basics." Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University.

Blumberg, A. (1984). The craft (not art, not science) of school administration and some other rambling thoughts. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Buchmann, M. Improving education by talking: Argument or conversation? (1985). Teachers College Record, 86, 441-453.

Carter, K. & Doyle, W. (1982, March). Variations in academic tasks in high and average ability classes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Collingwood, R. (1958). The principles of art. New York: Oxford University Press.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53, 159-199.

Education Week. (1985) Changing course: A 50-state survey of reform measures. February 6, p. 11.

Fielding, G. D. & Schalock, H. D. (1985). Promoting the professional development of teachers and administrators. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Gersten, R., Green, W., & Davis, G. (1985, April). The realities of instructional leadership: An intensive study of four inner city schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, P. W. (1959). The highly intelligent and the highly creative adolescent: A summary of some research findings. In C. W. Taylor (Ed.), The third University of Utah research conference on the identification of creative scientific talent (pp. 46-57). Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Glatthorn, A. A. (in press). Curriculum leadership. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.

Grant, G. (1985). Schools that make an imprint: Creating a strong positive ethos. In J. H. Bunzel (Ed.), Challenge to American schools:

The case for standards and values, pp. 127-146. New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, T. F. (1984). The formation of conscience in an age of technology. Syracuse: Syracuse University.

Howey, K. R. & Vaughan, J. C. (1983). Current patterns of staff development. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development. (Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising. In P. L. Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching (pp. 169-192). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Karweit, N. L. (1983). Time-on-task: A research review. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

Koestler, A. (1964). The act of creation. New York: Macmillan.

Levin, H. M., Glass, G. V., & Meister, G. R. (1984). Cost effectiveness of four educational interventions. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

McGreal, T. L. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rosenshine, B. & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.), pp. 376-391). New York: Macmillan.

Rossmiller, R. A. (1982, September). Managing school resources to improve student achievement. Paper presented at the State Superintendent Conference for District Administrators, Madison, WI.

Schein, E. (1973). Professional education. New York: McGraw Hill.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in practice. New York: Basic Books.

Sergiovanni, T. (1986). A theory of practice for clinical supervision. In J. S. Smyth (Ed.), Clinical supervision: Theory, research, and practice. London: Croom-Helm.

Sieber, R. T. (1979). Classmates as workmates: Informal peer activity in the elementary school. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10, 207-235.

Sparks, G. M. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 41, 65-72.

Squires, D. A., Huitt, W. G., & Segars, J. K. (1981). Improving classrooms and schools: What's important. Educational Leadership, 39, 174-179.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., Bernstein, H. T. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Figure 1. Guidelines for Developing Effective Staff Development Programs

1. Choose research-based content.
2. Involve teachers in planning and provide administrative support.
3. Conduct several training sessions two or three weeks apart.
4. Include presentation, demonstration, practice, and feedback as activities.
5. During training, provide opportunities for small group discussion.
6. Between workshops, encourage teachers to visit each other's classes and to give each other objective feedback about the use of the skill.
7. Develop in teachers a philosophical acceptance of the new practices by enabling them to discuss the research and to express doubts.
8. Provide for detailed discussions of the details of implementation and encourage teachers to discuss their own experiences in implementing the new practice.
9. Encourage teachers to try only one or two new practices after each workshop.
10. For more complex practices, provide more time and practice.

Figure 2. Options for Professsional Development

Teacher's Name_____School_____Date____

Basic assumptions:

1. All teachers will participate in system-based and school-based staff development.

2. All teachers will be observed informally several times during the year.

3. All teachers will be rated by an administrator.

Teacher's preferred option: (Check one)

_____ For this year I prefer not to participate in any special professional development activities other than those outlined above.

_____ For this year I prefer to work cooperatively with colleagues using the processes identified below.

_____ For this year I prefer to work in a self-directed mode using the processes identified below.

Preferred developmental processes: (Check all those which at this point seem desirable.)

_____ Observe a colleague and confer about observation.

_____ Exchange classes with a colleague and confer about exchange.

_____ Develop new course of study.

_____ Develop and try out new instructional materials.

_____ Improve an advanced teaching skill

_____ Conduct action research

_____ View and analyze video tapes of own teaching

_____ Plan and implement an independent study program

_____ Enroll in graduate course or special workshops

_____ Other_____